UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Two Views on the Roosevelt Administration

I. Why I Support the Roosevelt Administration
- - - - - *Curtis W. Reese*

II. Why I Oppose the Roosevelt Administration
- - - - *John Haynes Holmes*

The Crisis in Democracy - *Carl Wittke*

Concerning Mussolini - *Lola Maverick Lloyd*

Trumpets on New Horizons

VOLUME CXVIII NUMBER 1

Chicago, September 7, 1936

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly Until Further Notice — *Subscription $3.00 Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* — CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 3

ARTICLES—
Selected—*Bishop Ambrose* 3
Two Views on the Roosevelt Administration:
I. Why I Support the Roosevelt Administration—CURTIS W. REESE..... 6
II. Why I Oppose the Roosevelt Administration—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 8
The Crisis in Democracy—CARL WITTKE..... 11
Concerning Mussolini—LOLA MAVERICK LLOYD..... 14

POETRY—
While Men Subject Their Brothers—F. TEN HOOR..... 5
Praecognitio—FLORA WHITE 18

TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS—
The Foxes Have Holes—MARIE D'AUTREMONT GERRY..... 15
Unshriven—VIVIAN NEYERDAHL 15
The Vandal—EDWIN BARLOW EVANS..... 15
Citadel of Silence—M. LOUISE GREEN..... 15

THE STUDY TABLE—
Roosevelt and Capitalism—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES..... 16
The Relation of Christianity to Communism—GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE.. 16

CORRESPONDENCE—
To the President—Letter I—EDITH WYNNER 17
Letter II—GEORGIA LLOYD 17
From Governor Landon's State—MAMIE SCHELLENBERG..... 18
Gandhi Misquoted—and UNITY Misled—K. NATARAJAN and M. K. GANDHI.. 18

THE FIELD—
Labor Sunday Message, 1936, and Facts for Labor Sunday—Executive Committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America..... 2
A Creed for Cooperative Living—JAY T. STOCKING in *Advance*..... 20
We Will Not Fight!—ROBERT SMILIE, M. P..... 20

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Labor Sunday Message, 1936

(Issued by the Executive Committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, through its Department of the Church and Social Service.)

Requested to be read in the churches on Labor Sunday, September 6, 1936, or on the first available Sunday thereafter.

On a day in the spring of this year this wireless message came from London: "Edward VIII, after visiting the great new liner, *Queen Mary*, and the squalid Glasgow slums, turned to someone near him and asked, 'How do you reconcile a world that has produced this mighty ship with the slums we have just visited?' "

That question has to do with more than an accidental contrast. It focuses the drastic interrogation which the Christian mind and heart must direct to our whole civilization now.

How can we reconcile a world which provides, on the one hand, luxury and freedom for the few, and a sordid, drab, and pinched existence for the many? For the Christian conscience there can be no reconciliation while these facts remain. We cannot merely look the other way. Rather, we must look straight at the harsh reality and never be at rest until we have set in motion redeeming social purposes which can change old facts to new ones, juster, fairer, and more kind.

Our danger today is that the discontent with social and economic evils which these recent tragic years have roused may try to satisfy itself with soft compromise. We are in danger of looking at the ship and forgetting the slums. As the first signs of industrial recovery begin to appear and men's energies launch out with a reviving boldness, we may think that we can leave behind us the dark record of the depression years. We may imagine that unemployment, poverty, the disintegration of families and the disillusionment of millions of people, old and young, will somehow take care of themselves. The ships of our economic fortunes are on the high seas again, we think. Never mind the cost at which they were put there.

(*Continued on page* 19)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXVIII MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1936 No. 1

JUSTICE

"Justice has to do with the society of the human race, and the community at large. For that which holds society together is divided into two parts—justice and good-will, which also is called liberality and kindness. Justice seems to me the loftier, liberality the more pleasing, of the two. The one gives judgment, the other shows goodness.

"But that very thing is excluded with us which philosophers think to be the office of justice. For they say that the first expression of justice is to hurt no one, except when driven to it by wrongs received. This is put aside by the authority of the Gospel. For the Scripture wills that the Spirit of the Son of Man should be in us, who came to give grace, not to bring harm.

"Next they considered it consonant with justice that one should treat common, that is, public property as public, and private as private. But this is not even in accord with nature, for nature has poured forth all things for all men for common use. God has ordered all things to be produced, so that there should be food in common to all, and that the earth should be a common possession for all. Nature, therefore, has produced a common right for all, but greed has made it a right for a few.

"Here, too, we are told that the Stoics taught that all things which are produced on the earth are created for the use of man, but that men are created for the sake of men, so that mutually one may be of advantage to another. But whence have they got such ideas but out of the holy Scriptures? For it is in accordance with the will of God and the union of nature, that we ought to be of mutual help one to the other; and to vie with each other in doing duties, to lay all our advantages as it were before all, and to bring help one to the other from a feeling of devotion or of duty, by giving money, or by doing something, at any rate in some way or other; so that the charm of human fellowship may ever grow sweeter amongst us, and none may ever be recalled from their duty by the fear of danger, but rather account all things, whether good or evil, as their own concern.

"Great, then, is the glory of justice; for she, existing rather for the good of others than of self, is an aid to the bonds of union and fellowship amongst us. She holds so high a place that she has all things laid under her authority, and further can bring help to others and supply money; nor does she refuse her services, but even undergoes dangers for others.

"Who would not gladly climb and hold the heights of this virtue, were it not that greed weakens and lessens the power of such a virtue? For as long as we want to add to our possessions and to heap up money, to take into our possession fresh lands, and to be the richest of all, we have cast aside the form of justice and have lost the blessing of kindness toward all. How can he be just that tries to take from another what he wants for himself?

"The desire to gain power also enervates the perfect strength and beauty of justice. For how can he, who attempts to bring others under his own power, come forward on behalf of others? And how can a man help the weak against the strong, when he himself aspires to great power at the cost of liberty?"

—Bishop Ambrose (334-397 A. D.)

VALETE!

JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND and JAMES H. WEST, UNITY's two oldest friends and supporters, men whose attachment goes back to the earliest days of Jenkin Lloyd Jones and the founding of this paper, died within a few days of each other last month. Mr. West's poems and hymns were a feature of UNITY for forty years. Dr. Sunderland's articles and letters appeared in our earliest as well as our latest issues. Both were honored members of our Editorial Board. We shall remember them in death even as we have known and loved them in life. In the next issue of UNITY (September 21st), we plan to memorialize them both with gratitude and acclaim. *Valete, carissimi fratres!*

CIVIL WAR AND INTERVENTION

As day passes into day, it becomes evident that we have in Spain not a mere uprising or armed rebellion, but a civil war of large dimensions. The struggle is being bitterly fought by armed forces which hold cities, provinces, ports, and military resources, and in all probability will continue, with varying fortunes, for an indefinite period. It is also apparent that the fight is between Communists (Loyalists) on the one side and Fascists (Rebels) on the other. In the beginning the character of the contending factions seemed less clear-cut. On the government side, the Communists were by no means in any dominant position. The Cabinet was Socialist and democratic, not "red" in the Moscow sense. On the other side, so we were told, were the military, the royalists, etc. But now has appeared that same line of cleavage which is tending more and more these days to divide Europe into two great camps—Fascists and Communists. The history of Europe in the days ahead would seem to be a duel to the death between these two revolutionary forces, left and right—and this cruel and bloody fray in Spain is one chapter of the dreadful story. It is this fact which makes the possibility of the civil war in Spain developing into a Euro-

pean war—the dreaded "next war"—so terrible a reality. Intervention in the Spanish struggle is the great peril. If Italy, or Russia, made any genuine move to aid "black" or "red" in Spain, there would at once be a general scramble—and the war would be on! It is in this sense that the Spanish situation is comparable not to Belgium in 1914, as so many ignorant newspapers are saying, but rather to France in 1789. The French Revolution of that year led promptly to civil war, and this war in turn brought intervention on behalf of the Bourbons, which intervention led in turn to those twenty years of European conflict which culminated in Napoleon and ended at Waterloo. It is the possibility that such events are now before us which makes the civil war in Spain the one most important event of the present hour.

THE RUSSIAN CONSPIRACY

What first impresses us in the great Russian conspiracy trials, we must confess, is the tremendous drama of the thing. Here is the French Revolution come back again! In Zinoviev, tried and convicted, is the reincarnation of Robespierre. Remember how the great leader of the French Terror raved and raged against his enemies, mastered for his own frenzied and fanatical uses the revolutionary party of the day, and then at last, as the wheel of fate spun its dreadful round, himself came before the red tribunal for the condemnation of his peers! In all this drama of a century and a half ago, we see only the anticipation, so to speak, of what now is happening in Moscow. Zinoviev is only the Russian Robespierre! The second impression which we bring from this trial is the overwhelming realization that there is no end to this quarrel between Stalin and Trotsky. It is war to the death. Russia was not large enough to contain the contending chieftains, and now the world proves to be not large enough. Trotsky and all his group must be wiped out ere the regime can be at peace. What is there about revolution that makes men so relentlessly hateful and cruel, and why must civil war between fellow-countrymen and comrades be so much more terrible than war between aliens? Witness Spain, as well as Russia! But having confessed this much, we now fall into confusion. We can understand hostility and vengeance carried through to the bitter end, but not in terms of such extravaganza as has just been paraded upon the stage in Moscow. Conspiracy of this dime-novel variety may conceivably be associated with a demagogue of the Zinoviev type, but not with men of the calibre of Trotsky and Kamenev. And what are we to think of the comic opera spectacle of defendants on trial for their lives not only confessing guilt, but vying with one another in presenting alleged evidence to prove the case against them? Russian trials are very different from ours, but is Russian mentality so different as well? Only Trotsky, far removed from the scene, has seemed to act sanely. All the rest seem to be mere madmen, or strange characters from some wild work of fiction. We have stood fascinated, frightened, horrified before this spectacle—and, above all, amazed!

CAMPAIGN MANAGERS

What has come over the nature of our presidential campaigns that the managers have suddenly become the chief figures in the fray? There was a time when managers were content to do their work behind the scenes, letting the candidates hold the limelight and make the seeches. Mark Hanna was perhaps as conspicuous as William McKinley in the 1896 campaign, but this was an exception to the rule, made conspicuous by the fact that the Republicans in that campaign had nothing but gold dollars to match Bryan's silver words, and Hanna manipulated the dollars. But in this current campaign, it is the managers who are to the fore. Thus, on the Democratic side, the unctuous and odious "Jim" Farley is for some unaccountable reason allowed to lead the van of the fighting forces. It is incredible, of course, that the President will not assume command in due time, but for the moment, at least, it is Farley's speeches, and Farley's interviews, and Farley's prognostications which dominate attention. On the Republican side, the situation is still more amazing. From the very instant of Governor Landon's nomination, his political manager, that bright, smart young man, John W. Hamilton, leaped to the front, and has held the center of the stage. Governor Landon made his acceptance speech, but Mr. Hamilton drowned the echoes with his sophomoric chatter. Governor Landon took to the road and made hourly speeches from the end of his observation car, but it was not these speeches, but rather Hamilton's running comments thereupon which filled the columns of the newspapers. Mr. Hamilton is undoubtedly energetic, ubiquitous, supremely self confident, as "Jim" Farley is tireless, arrogant, and diabolically clever. But whom are we electing in this campaign, and who is going to run the government when the electoral choice is made? We beg to ask that the campaign managers retire to their offices for a little while, and give the candidates a chance. Here the Socialists set a good example! Norman Thomas, in his able, highly intelligent way, is doing the talking for his party. His campaign manager—who knows who he is?

IS INSANITY A DISGRACE?

The death by suicide of Representative Marion Zioncheck will probably have disappeared from the public mind before this editorial can be published. If so, we would remind our readers of this tragic episode, that we may use it as a text for some badly needed advice on the question of insanity. Zioncheck seemed obviously to have had a disordered mind. Originally a man of high social ideals, with a fine record of public service, he suddenly went distraught. For months he ran amuck, a danger not merely to himself, but to everybody within the area of his activities. If a dog had acted with even a small measure of the irresponsibility which Zioncheck manifested in his wild drinking, his crazy automobile driving, his wading in public fountains, his exploits and deviltries of incredible description, the poor animal would have been straightway shot. At last the public authorities intervened and attempted, in mercy as well as in protection of the public welfare, to confine Zioncheck in a sanitarium for observation and treatment. *But his friends would not have it so!* His wife, his mother, his sister, his personal associates, his political supporters in the Commonwealth Party, all insisted that he be released, and even run again for Congress. They evidently thought that it would be a disgrace for Zioncheck to be adjudged insane. But what was the alternative? If not insane, then he was sane; and, if sane, then, in the light of his deeds, he was either an idiotic nuisance, or else a criminal. The disgrace, in other words, lay on the side of his sanity, not of his insanity. The one most tender, loving, considerate thing that could have been done in this case was to accept the verdict of the doctors, who knew a lunatic when they saw him, and put Zioncheck in an asylum. For *there is no disgrace in insanity*—no more than in cancer, or tuberculosis, or heart-failure. Mentality depends upon a physical organism, the brain, and this organism just as naturally breaks down, or becomes diseased or disordered, as any other organism. Had Zioncheck's skull been opened, an ulcer would probably have been revealed, or diseased tissue. And why is an ulcer on the brain any more disgraceful than an ulcer in the stomach, or diseased tissue in the kidneys? Zioncheck needed not vindication but treatment, nursing, medicine. His friends say that it was the newspapers which killed him. O, no!—it was his friends who killed him.

A BAN ON PREACHING

Dr. Frederic S. Fleming, rector of Trinity Church, New York, has come out for a moratorium on preaching. He declares that there is practically no preaching today which is worthwhile. We wonder how he knows! Dr. Fleming, like other preachers, hears practically no preaching but his own, and it is hardly fair, is it, to base so sweeping a judgment on so slender a foundation of evidence. The editors of the *Nation* came out "100 per cent" in favor of Dr. Fleming's recommendation, since they despise "people who prefer talking to thinking." But what do these editors know about contemporary preaching? We hazard a wager that not one of the *Nation's* staff has entered a church and listened to a sermon in years. There are sermon-tasters, men and women who have listened to many preachers in many churches through many years, who would be justified in having an opinion on this question. For the great majority of persons, including ministers themselves and editors of radical journals, there are only two available sources of information. One is the reports of sermons published in the Monday morning newspapers. This, as a matter of fact, is no source at all. In no department of a modern newspaper is the standard of reporting so low as in this department. If a sermon were reported as carefully as a symphony concert, or a baseball game, or a murder, this material might prove something, but the snips and scraps of sermons which now find their way into print mean nothing. The other source of information about contemporary preaching is the numerous volumes of sermons which in recent years have been coming from the presses of our best publishing houses. These volumes present an illuminating survey of pulpit utterance in this country today, and show a standard of intelligence, courage, idealism, and sound learning which is a glory of the church. We venture to suggest that preaching has at no time in the history of Christianity been on the whole so able as it is today. Our preachers have nothing to apologize for. It is for their critics to apologize for not knowing what is going on.

While Men Subject Their Brothers

While men subject their brothers for a profit,
Ruin and kill them, and think nothing of it
The moon remains a cold and distant planet,
Saying to God: "You finish, you began it!"
God smiles a weary smile, turns to the devil:
"This is your work!" He scans the bloody revel
And grins malevolently, the while he worries
Another helpless nation with his furies.
"Yes, it is my work. And I shall not have finished
Until all trace of you is so diminished
That men are wiser than the God who made them!"
"Like weeds are taller than the tree that shades them,"
Jehovah answers, turning to his labors,
While men continue to destroy their neighbors.

F. TEN HOOR.

Two Views on the Roosevelt Administration

I. Why I Support the Roosevelt Administration—Curtis W. Reese

I support the Roosevelt administration as on the whole the most effective political means of social progress now available or likely soon to be available in the American scene. The Right Opposition, represented by the Republican Party, the Liberty League, and various other less worthy Legions and Unions, could hardly be considered a social instrumentality. The Left Opposition, represented by the Socialists, the Communists, and other less consistent radicals, while socially oriented, nevertheless has no practical bearing on American political life at this time.

For one who wants to be both socially minded and socially effective today, there seems to me to be no other choice than to go with Roosevelt. Obviously such a person cannot go with Landon or Lemke. He might possibly go with Thomas or Browder as a sort of gesture in the general direction of Utopia. But the real choice is not between the New Deal and the New Jerusalem; it is between the New Deal and the Old Guard.

1. I support the Roosevelt administration as the most immediately promising expression of democratic possibilities in the actual American situation. American democracy stands for the right and the ability of the people to work out their destiny in accordance with their varying experiences and their growing ideals. It is a slow process. It is evolutionary, not revolutionary. Its aim is the possible best, not the ideal best. It refuses to allow what should be to stand in the way of what can be. This is the point of view of the New Deal, and it is as native to America as is the philosophy of which it is the political expression. I do not want to labor this point unduly, since it applies more against the Left Opposition than it does that of the Right. I do, however, want to make plain my conviction that he who allows the ideal best to stand in the way of the possible best makes of the ideal a positive menace. Ideals are guides by means of which we determine whether movements are proceeding in the right general direction, not clubs to be used on the already bruised heads of emerging possibilities.

2. I favor the Roosevelt administration because, as a corollary to point one, it is America's first conscious and large-scale expression of experimentation in our political life. Where absolutists and Utopians find in this attitude reason for condemnation I find every reason for praise. This is precisely the attitude that dominates modern science and that has caused more progress in the development of the arts and instrumentalities of civilization in one century than had been made in all previous centuries under the dominance of metaphysics. Any good journalist with a smattering of political science can outline at least six perfectly good Utopias in thirty minutes, and produce any reasonable number, on order, at the rate of one every five minutes. But they would not work, and they could not, because they would have no relation to actualities. Experiment, conscious and widespread over many areas of life, has characterized the Roosevelt administration. Some experiments have been vetoed by the Supreme Court, as the AAA; others by Comptroller McCarl, as the gigantic forestation plan for the West; others by the Congress, as the Passamaquoddy Power Project; but Roosevelt remains firm in his advocacy of trying things to see whether they will work—or will be allowed to work. In three years this attitude has already produced concrete results, such as the guaranty of bank deposits, the TVA, the Social Security Act, the HOLC, and soil conservation, any one of which would go far toward justifying an administration. If to these be added those socially valid acts which the Supreme Court by a narrow margin has thrown out, the record of efforts becomes astonishingly massive. And even if no concrete results had been attained in three years, the change in national attitude from stark reaction to venturesome action would mark the Roosevelt administration as the most significant in the recent history of our Republic.

3. I favor the Roosevelt administration for its effort to control and adjust supply and demand. Facing a bankrupt agricultural system, with plenty to sell and few able to buy, the Administration attempted on the one hand to increase purchasing power through the NRA, public works and direct relief; and on the other to adjust the supply to market demands, plus tariff-like benefits to the producers. Incidental to this was the purchase by the Government of certain surplus products and their distribution as additional relief. To some such program as was followed, I can see only two alternatives—either complete bankruptcy of the farm population or complete socialization of agriculture. To have allowed the first would have been socially suicidal; to have accomplished the second would have been as politically impossible as it would have been socially undesirable.

Here, in the attempt to control and adjust supply and demand, we have one of those rare governmental programs going to the very roots of social well-being, and opening up new and unexplored possibilities in fields where intelligent social control has not been thought possible in a profit agronomy. It may not be possible; but it should at least be attempted, along with something like the Bankhead Farm Bill, before we abandon independent farming for either absentee ownership or collectivized agriculture.

4. A dominant desire of the New Deal, and one that makes me especially favorable to it, is that of effecting a demarcation and a coordination of the areas of private and public ownership and operation, which the Right Opposition would not, and the Left Opposition could not, effect. It is entirely too early in human history to conclude that there are no valid choices between a capitalist and a socialist economy. Undoubtedly many things can be done more effectively and economically on a collective basis; and equally certain is it that other things can be more satisfactorily done on a private basis. Where these areas lie and where they overlap, no great effort has yet been made to discover. In the realm of power the TVA and other similar projects are being established as experiments to determine what next steps are possible and desirable. It was not politically possible to plunge headlong into the nationalization of power; yet it was high time that private monopoly in this field be subjected to real tests of its social efficiency and economy.

5. A rather unexpected and yet most encouraging New Deal development, and one that I especially favor, is the modification of the traditional doctrine of States Rights and the definite enlargement of Federal responsibility for the general welfare—without which permanent progress is impossible. Strangely enough the two major parties, or at least the groups now wearing the old labels, have about-faced on this issue. It has become perfectly evident that any party aiming at fundamental reforms must advocate enlargement of the scope of Federal responsibility and power; and that the traditional doctrine of States Rights is merely a convenient excuse for failure to advocate basic changes in our social structure. Drought and commerce alike leap over state lines. The causes of poverty are national in scope and must be dealt with nationally. The forces let loose by modern technology cannot be confined within arbitrary limits. Child labor and wage slavery are not primarily state issues; they are primarily national issues and must be settled nationally. The achievement of President Roosevelt in swinging a sectionally-conscious party into line behind a nationally-conscious program is a feat of statesmanship of the first order.

6. I support the Roosevelt administration because it has laid the foundation of social security. For a quarter of a century every socially-awake person in America had been amazed and ashamed of America's backwardness in regard to social security legislation. Then came *Looking Forward*. Here were the words of a man who knew what was going on in the world, who was acquainted with the terminology of social security, and who was actively sympathetic with social legislation. Here was a new deal indeed! In less than three years we spanned a quarter of a century and put our country abreast of the social legislation of other countries. We laid the foundation for old-age assistance, pensions, unemployment insurance, and other types of aid to those in need. Granted that the Social Security Act is not all that it should be, that the minimum is too low, and that the machinery is unduly complex, the fact still remains that a major step long delayed has now been taken; that but for Franklin D. Roosevelt that step would not yet have been taken, and we would still be in the period of the poor laws and of private philanthropy.

7. I favor the Roosevelt administration for having extended the civil service law and having raised the quality of personnel and practice in public service beyond anything before current in American public life. American public service has not been notable for its excellence. In the main, the Roosevelt appointments have markedly raised the level. The Roosevelt advisors have been chiefly men of intelligence and social foresight, thus giving rise to the Brain Trust quib. Ickes, Wallace, Richberg, Morgan, and others of similar calibre and disinterestedness, are not exceptional but typical. In the various special set-ups, which because of their emergency nature were not under civil service, modern personnel practice was inaugurated, a practice which is distinctly in advance of traditional civil service practice. When Henry Wallace was asked for a list of certain of his employees in the AAA, the Congress got a list of one thousand men, together with the colleges and universities from which they had been graduated, and the degrees they had taken. The TVA, the Security Board, and other agencies, could show equally competent staffs. Of course, cheap politicians and disappointed office seekers will rail about Brain Trusts, and hired cartoonists will draw mortar boards; but those who know what public service means will rejoice that wardheelers no longer possess the prerogative of selecting important public officials.

8. I favor the Roosevelt administration for conscientiously attempting to fulfil its platform pledges, for having done so to a degree unusual in American politics, and for having the courage to attack with new instruments problems that could not have been foreseen. In support of this, I cite a few examples referring to the more controversial issues. The platform pledged economy. Immediately upon taking office, the Roosevelt administration enacted four economy laws which resulted in reducing general expenditures from more than 4¼ billions in the fiscal year 1932 to slightly over 3 billions in the fiscal year 1934. But special expenditures for relief and emergency purposes could not and should not have been kept much, if any, lower than they have been by any party in power in such a crisis. The platform pledged the maintenance of the national credit and a sound currency. In pursuance of this pledge, ten Acts were passed. Today Government bonds are at a premium; and the Government borrows short-term money at one-eighth of 1 per cent. The platform pledged certain tariff changes, including reciprocal agreements. Already such agreements have been entered into with fourteen nations. The platform pledged the extension of credit to the states and expansion of Federal public works. The fulfilling of this pledge has kept states from bankruptcy and millions from starvation. The platform pledged unemployment and old-age insurance under state laws. The Security Act is the answer. The platform pledged aid to agriculture in various ways, including reduction of interest on farm loans and effective control of crop surpluses. The fulfillment of this pledge by no less than eighteen Acts of Congress is one of the chief indictments brought against the New Deal. The platform pledged conservation and the public use of the nation's water power. The TVA and other like projects are the answer. The platform pledged protection to the investing public. Eleven Acts have been passed with this end in view. The platform pledged efforts to maintain peace. The Good Neighbor Policy has revolutionized our relationship to the countries south of us. The platform pledged repeal. That pledge was fulfilled. But why multiply examples? The record is as imposing as it is exceptional. No, the real cause of grief is not that platform pledges have been violated, but that they have been fulfilled too well. And as for those things done, but not foreseen in the party platform—let it be said that emergencies are not in the habit of waiting four years for a party caucus to determine how to deal with them.

9. I support the Roosevelt Administration because with incredible rapidity it is effecting a more mature attitude on the part of the American people regarding the functions of government. In the past the American attitude has been that the Government existed chiefly for purposes of external defense, internal policing, juridical arrangements, postal operations, and the like. Slowly through the years education and certain other aspects of our life have become governmental functions. But in general we have been pompous about our "rugged

individualism" and our "freedom from governmental interference."

In the midst of a major economic catastrophe the Roosevelt Administration at once assumed governmental responsibility for social and economic leadership, for both large and small scale financing, for a more equitable distribution of economic goods, for social security, for more decent and adequate housing, and for the conservation of our natural resources. I have been amazed at the willingness with which the people have accepted governmental leadership in fields heretofore regarded as the private domain of financiers and special interests. Even the NRA received popular support to a surprising extent. The farmers have accepted social control beyond anything that could have been predicted. Relief for those in need is no longer thought of as private matter, except by a few who believe that poverty was created for the purpose of enriching the spirits of those who relieve it. The theory that the Government is best that governs least has suffered a severe jolt. We are beginning to realize that the Government is the very best means of cooperation for the common good.

I do not, of course, claim that the Roosevelt Administration is solely responsible for this widespread change in attitude; but I do hold that the speed of change has been rapidly increased by the readiness of the Administration to assume leadership, its willingness to take large risks for the common weal, and its large measure of success in such undertakings.

10. Finally, I favor the New Deal as an effective alternative to Fascism on the one hand, and chaos on the other. America has reached the stage where the old order simply cannot stand up under the strain of modern conditions. It could be propped up for a while by bayonets as is being done in Italy and Germany, or it could fall into the chaos of a mad scramble of opposing factions that would wipe out the gains of 150 years and wreck the world's most delicately balanced industrial structure. Either of these eventualities could happen here. The way to keep one or both of them from happening here is to give a fair chance and full cooperation to that type of political economy now called the New Deal but which in fact is democracy meeting new conditions, and which, while holding on to goods already possessed, raises its sails to catch new winds of promise blowing from afar.

This is no time to turn backward. Nor is it the time to dream of what might happen in a world differently constructed or in a country with a different history and a different present. Issues of immediate moment press upon us. We cannot evade the responsibility of a choice; and I choose Roosevelt.

II. Why I Oppose the Roosevelt Administration—John Haynes Holmes

I am opposed to the Roosevelt administration, but from the standpoint of the Left rather than of the Right. My dissent is that of Norman Thomas, Socialist, rather than that of Alf Landon, Republican. Mr. Roosevelt, so far as he has any self-consistency at all, is in the middle of the political road—tending toward the Left, as he himself declares, but wobbling frequently toward the Right—and it is inevitable, in such position, that he should please neither flank, conservative, nor radical.

In opposing the President, I am not unmindful of, as I trust I am not ungrateful for, certain remarkable achievements of his administration. I believe his motives are sincere and unselfish, and his desire genuinely to help the common man in his distress. I have no sympathy with the charge that he wants or is tending to become a dictator, though dictatorship of the Fascist variety is most certainly involved as a possibility in the ultimate outcome of the present crisis. I have already acclaimed in these columns the TVA (a greater monument to progress than the Panama Canal), the HOLC (a program of relief as wise as it is beneficent), the CCC (a constructive as well as romantic feat of statesmanship), the Security Act (a first, even though very short and stumbling, step toward the establishment of economic security for the people of this country). Mr. Roosevelt has much to his credit, as these and other accomplishments indicate. But none the less I cannot support his work, nor convince myself that any fundamental or permanent good can come from his continuance in office.

1. I am first of all opposed to the administration for moral reasons. I believe the President has wilfully sacrificed principle to expediency, and thus irreparably damaged the credit and honor of the nation. That his actions in this regard have won the approval of so many citizens, or rather have been regarded with so considerable a degree of indifference, impresses me as a sure symptom of the degeneracy of our age. This seems to be one more instance to prove the truth of Dr. Alexis Carrel's assertion that we have so far lost our moral standards today that we are no longer able to distinguish between right and wrong. When, or if, that time has come, the fall of civilization is at hand; and it is because Mr. Roosevelt so lightly casts aside all moral ideals in so many of his policies that I fear for his fatal influence upon the future.

The supreme instance of this indictment is of course the President's withdrawal of gold from the nation's currency, and his suspension of gold payments. In citing this, let me say, I am not arguing for the gold standard, about which technical question I know nothing. I am raising not a money but a moral question—the ethics of Mr. Roosevelt's action. It may be said, as it has been said, that this action was necessary to save the country from financial ruin. Personally, I do not believe this assertion. Such statement is pure supposition—a guess and not a fact! But, even so, I contend that basic to the whole situation in 1933 was the nation's plighted word, its bond signed and sealed, and that the loss of the moral credit therein involved was greater, in the long run, than any financial credit whatsoever. In any case, I assert that there were other things that could have been done in the currency crisis, other remedies that might have been resorted to, before the President jettisoned the nation's honor. I am old enough to remember the day when an earlier Democratic president, Grover Cleveland, faced a situation not dissimilar to that which faced Franklin Roosevelt three years ago. In that crisis, Mr. Cleveland had but one thought—that the country must make good its

promise to pay in gold *at any cost*—and, at the cost of nearly everything, his own personal popularity and political reputation included, he kept the faith. Contrast with this the action of Mr. Roosevelt who, in an hour of difficulty, sacrificed the character of the nation not last but first. Blithely he announced that the government would not fulfil its promises to pay, and, in addition, without warrant in law or morals, seized the money of the people and gave back a little over half-payment in return. I say that this was *immoral*. There is nothing you can do about it, said the Supreme Court. It is a *fait accompli!* But one thing you can do, and that is cry out against it.

Another illustration of the President's easy-going sacrifice of moral principle to political expediency is his repeated and flagrant violation of his campaign pledges to the people. Mr. Roosevelt was frank and fearless in his statements in 1932 of what he would do if he were elected. He began by accepting the Chicago platform "one hundred per cent." He went on, in his speeches, to promise a dozen things—to reduce federal expenditures at least 25 per cent, to balance the budget, to preserve sound money at any price. If he had tried to do any one of these and other things, he might be forgiven. It could now be persuasively argued that he had done his best, but that circumstances were too much for him. But Mr. Roosevelt did not attempt to do what he had solemnly pledged himself to do. On the contrary, with a happy smile and a jaunty gesture, he tossed everything overboard and proceeded to do what he pleased — things not only unannounced in the Democratic platform, but undreamed of in the Democratic philosophy. Is a public man no longer bound by his public word? Have we got to that point in our American life where no man's bond is longer to be held sacred? Is it possible to believe anything Mr. Roosevelt now says in party platform or speech of acceptance, or to have any atom of confidence that he will do in the next four years what now he promises to do? These may seem to be silly questions in an age like this. But that they should really seem to be silly is itself the most dreadful revelation of what this age really is. I am alarmed, when I think of it, that we have actually come to a time when there is no longer any such thing as the honor of the plighted word, even in the head of the republic. I may be old-fashioned, quixotic, or (what a joke!) puritanical, but to my mind there is still such a thing as morals, the true and good and honorable in contrast to the expedient, and I can support no man who is heedless of this revered reality.

A third illustration of this complaint is to be found in the President's shameless return to the spoils system, under the influence of Mr. Farley. I think I could stand this offense, bad as it is, if Mr. Roosevelt were only honest about it—as honest, for example, as old Andrew Jackson, whom the President presumes to admire so much. Jackson raided the political offices of the other party as ruthlessly as he raided the territory of the enemy in time of war, and made no bones about it. But in an administration which has done more to smash the ideals of civil service reform than any administration since this reform first won acceptance by the government, we have a President who not only smiles indifferently, but actually boasts of his non-partisan purity in this field. Either Mr. Roosevelt does not know what is going on at the hands of his triple-headed political advisor, Mr. Farley, or else he does not care. In either case we have a man not to be trusted with the moral responsibilities of his great office.

2. My second objection to the administration is directed against the whole plan or program of presidential procedure. As a matter of fact, there *is* no plan or program—and that is my objection. I see no evidence during these last three years that the President has known what he was doing, that he understood the nature of his problem, that he had diagnosed a situation and was applying scientific remedies for its mending. All I can see is a policy of hit-and-miss, try this—try that, a vast disorder of confused and frequently contradictory policies, some good, some bad, all composing a hodge-podge which is the antithesis of constructive and creative statesmanship.

Try to reconcile the NRA, for example, with the AAA, which latter was deliberately an undertaking to save the farmers at the expense of the industrial employers and employees who were supposed to be helped by the former. Try to reconcile the NRA with itself —salvation for business by establishing and safeguarding an aggregate of huge monopolies and giving them all-power! Remember the old CWA, which was created without warning, destroyed without warning, and then without warning resurrected in the present WPA? If the government believes in relief, why not organize relief as England has organized it, for example; or if the government believes in public works, why not organize public works on a firm basis, to be carried forward over a long period of time? Then there was the Passamaquoddy project, which took us into the romantic realm of Jules Verne. This was twinned by the Florida Ship Canal, which was condemned by engineers, financiers, and shipmasters, but pushed by the White House until shelved by a disgusted Senate. Most wonderful was that idea of a tree-belt in the Middle West, a thousand miles long and three miles wide, millions of trees planted in unbroken rows from Canada to the gulf of Mexico, to prevent droughts and sand-storms and other ills of nature. Alice in Wonderland never saw or even dreamed anything like that! These are only samples of what has been going on during these last three years. If there was any coordination among these recovery and reconstruction projects, any evidence of consistent plan or wise foresight, any slightest suggestion of a campaign conducted by a commander who had an objective and a road to it, we might forgive mistakes and even wild-eyed fantasies. But nothing has held together, everything has been confusion —as witness the office-buildings of Washington which have been as near a reproduction of primeval chaos as the world has seen since Milton!

At the heart of all this hurly-burly sits a President who, like a child, seems to find a delight in making a noise and creating disorder. He himself is the best interpreter of the hit-and-miss character of his administration, for here at least he is perfectly frank in saying that he has no idea, from moment to moment, what he is going to do, or why. Thus, he has declared that his policy is experiment—that he will try anything, and, if that fails, try something else. At the opening of his administration, he compared himself to a quarter-back on a football field who calls any play that may seem to be needed in any new situation. Such remarks, supremely characteristic of the mind which conceives

them, reveal clearly the nature of the rule which now prevails over the lives of the American people. Mr. Roosevelt is not a statesman, but a playboy. He thinks nothing through, but acts on impulse, whim, or fancy. Not conception, or construction, or creation is his work, but *improvisation.* Like an amateur organist, he sits at the instrument of the nation's life, and instead of composing some masterpiece of ordered invention, he plays whatever comes into his head, rushing on gayly from tune to tune. It's amusing, exciting—but where does it get us?

It is easy to recognize statesmanship when it appears. What Bismarck did for Germany, what Stalin is now doing for Russia, what Washington and Hamilton did for early America—this is statesmanship. It gives us the picture of the captain on the bridge of a ship, who knows the port to which he is sailing, who sets his course to that port, and who holds to the course through whatever storms and perils. I do not find, or at least feel, such statesmanship here in this country in these trying days. An ingenious, resourceful, happy-go-lucky amateur yachtsman—yes! But a master mariner—no!

3. My final and fundamental objection to the Roosevelt administration is perhaps an extension of the above charge, but is in essence, I must believe, a point in itself, and one which penetrates to the heart of the whole issue now confronting this country and our entire western world. I refer to the fact that our society is at this moment involved in a supreme crisis of historic destiny—the passing of one type of civilization and the coming of another, what Romain Rolland calls in his latest masterpiece, *The Soul Enchanted,* "the death of a world" and "a world in birth." This Mr. Roosevelt does not recognize, or at least understand, and is thus hopelessly disqualified to lead the nation in this momentous hour.

To be more specific! What is happening today is the collapse of capitalism as the end of a vast historic era which began with the passing of medieval feudalism, and must be succeeded in due course by some type, probably various types, of economic cooperation, or collectivism. This event is not to be bewailed or regretted, since it is not a catastrophe, except in its incidental and temporary effects, but is a necessary transition of progress into a new age. Neither is it to be angrily resented nor condemned, since it is not the malevolent handiwork of brutal and greedy men, but an inevitable process of history. Here it is—something to be recognized, and directed and achieved. In Europe we see the crisis in its extreme forms of critical conflict —in Communism swung far to the left, and in Fascism (Naziism) swung far to the right. In other and truly democratic countries—Denmark, Norway, Sweden, England, and we hope America—we see the crisis embodied in progressive and peaceful forms of change. In France and Spain, the issue hangs in the balance between violent conflict and natural democratic development.

Now it is the contention of the President's enemies on the Right that he is the advocate and champion of collectivist change in this country. This charge, as a matter of fact, corresponds to no reality whatsoever, but is the mere projection of capitalistic fears as prompted by the terrific upheavals in continental Europe. In nothing that Mr. Roosevelt has been doing in the last three and more years is there the slightest suggestion of leadership toward the new cooperative society of the future, nor even of recognition of the need of such leadership. What Mr. Roosevelt has been trying to do, in so far as he has been trying to do anything clearly seen and intelligently understood, is to save capitalism in this country — to shore up the tottering economic structure of industrial finance before it collapses utterly — to repair the stalled engine of the existing economic machine before it stops for good and all. The very desperateness of his task—of getting capitalism going again at the very time when it is breaking down for good and all—is perhaps the most charitable explanation of the disorder and confusion of administrative activities since 1933. He has messed everything up because he has had no time to lose, and must try everything lest he find himself with complete and final wreckage on his hands! That the system is now going again, may well be argued—there are material and human resources in this country which are capable of keeping capitalism functioning, in one way or another, for a long time yet! That the administration is sincere in its social aims and has achieved beneficent social reforms, has already been admitted—but this is only doing for American capitalism what Bismarck did for German capitalism a half-century ago and Lloyd George for English capitalism a quarter-century ago. Under the stress of calamity, we are trying to revamp the system—modernize it and humanize it at one and the same time. But it is all work inside a doomed order of society, and therefore as futile and in a way as foolish as dear old Don Quixote's attempt to revive feudalism.

That the President is capitalistic to the core, the best friend of those who hate him most, is clearly indicated by what has been the major undertaking of his administration—to create scarcity, therewith restore high prices, and therewith guarantee profits. From the slaughter of the pigs, the plowing under of the cotton, and the limiting of the wheat acreage under the AAA, to the forbidding of factory extension and new manufacturing enterprise under the NRA, Mr. Roosevelt has strained every nerve, in a country crowded with idle and starving millions, to reduce production, raise prices, and thus increase corporate income. This is the idea of *production for profit,* prosperity for the producer at the expense of the consumer—capitalism in its full and perfect flower! Mr. Roosevelt boasts that his work is succeeding—and it *is,* in terms of increased corporation dividends, mounting stock sales, rising costs of living, an undiminished mass of unemployment, and a relief roll as large as ever. We are getting back to the good old days of Coolidge! A true economy, of course, would take abundance for its end, and low prices and indefinitely extended distribution for its means. To produce as much as possible and then get it into the hands of the people—*production for use!*—this is what we need, and what is coming. But Mr. Roosevelt does not or will not see it, and thus tries only to restore the old rather than to prepare the new.

Still more convincing as to his real attitude is the President's foreign policy. This is most clearly and dramatically shown in his insistence upon the building of the greatest army and navy ever known in the history of the American people. In this recent Congress, the appropriations for armaments on land and sea and in the air exceeded a billion dollars—the largest peacetime appropriations ever known. The excuse, of course, is defense—the same excuse offered for the same preparedness policy by Mussolini in Italy, Hitler in Ger-

many, and the Tories in Britain. But armies and navies on this vast scale are never for defense—the very nature of modern weapons is essentially aggressive! These armaments are the working machinery of imperialism —and imperialism is capitalism doing its work abroad as well as at home. Mr. Roosevelt is the most dangerous militarist who ever sat in the presidential chair in Washington. He is consciously a militarist because unconsciously, or semi-consciously, he is an imperialist. I would oppose him and his administration on this ground if on no other, for it is here, in this international field of armed competition and conflict, that our civilization is to be saved or lost forever.

4. But what alternative is there to Mr. Roosevelt? I see none at the present moment. But that fact is no reason for my supporting, or defending, or excusing, what I regard as reactionary, or even evil. There was no immediate alternative to Caesar in the early days of the Christian era. But there were those, none the less, who refused not only to bow the knee to Caesar, but also to do his will. They preferred to hide themselves away in quiet corners, with little groups of fellow-believers, or even to dig themselves into the earth in catacombs, and wait—and prepare!—for the Day of the Lord. Well, there may be those who are similarly minded and dedicated today. At any rate, I had rather keep my faith and bide my time, than give my support to a cause on the ground that, bad as it is, there is nothing better immediately in sight. In other words, I end where I began—with trust not in expediency, but in the right.

The Crisis in Democracy

CARL WITTKE

From a life rich with honors and full of accomplishment in many fields of human endeavor, Thomas Jefferson, the wisest and greatest American democrat, selected three achievements for which he hoped to be remembered by a grateful posterity—his authorship of the Declaration of Independence, his sponsorship of the Virginia statute of religious toleration, and his work as founder of the University of Virginia. In the first, Jefferson had given expression in words that have been an inspiration to the world, to the thought that democracy is a way of life, a creed, of tremendous driving power which rests upon a belief in the dignity, the worth, and the responsibility of every human being. In it he voiced the generous and noble conception of the fundamental human value of even the humblest and poorest among us. The second achievement rested on the principle that democracy is precious, because it embodies liberty; that liberty and self-expression have values in themselves, and that tolerance is perhaps life's highest and most beautiful achievement. In his last great endeavor, the founding of an institution of higher learning which should stand at the apex of the structure of public education in his state, Jefferson recognized that education is one of the most important "hooks" upon which democracy must hang, and that the rights and responsibilities of men in a democratic state, and that precious liberty which is based on tolerance can be preserved only where men's lives are anchored in intelligence, an intelligence which includes a high sense of honor, deep human sympathy, and a sense of duty to the beloved community to which we belong. Jefferson remains the greatest American apostle of the democratic way of life, and his words and deeds have pointed the way toward the ideal which America has tried for more than a century to translate into action.

Today the democratic way of life is on the defensive everywhere. Freedom has been hunted round the globe, and the map of Europe is hideous with blotches of red, black, and brown dictatorships. There are few countries left where it is not unpatriotic to think, where truth is not established by government proclamation, and where youth is not being regimented in the interests of a narrow, nationalistic pattern of life. The swastika, the black shirt, and the hammer and sickle have become the symbols of a better day for millions. Academic freedom has ceased to exist in the nation which taught the university world its finest ideals. Some of the finest flower of German, Italian, and Russian scholarship has been scattered throughout the world, into friendless exile, lonely poverty, or into the terror of the concentration camps. Fascism and Communism have at least this in common — they hate the democratic way of life, they believe that discussion is the foe of action, and that individual liberties are an obstacle to social progress.

Is there enough spiritual oxygen left in the world to keep alive, even among us, an attachment to liberty and self-government? Or will the flame burn lower and lower, and finally flicker out? America too has had her Ku Klux Klan, and similar organizations to persecute minorities in the name of patriotism and a purified nationalism. Our periodicals are filled with articles on variations of the now familiar theme—"Is democracy doomed?" The air is filled with talk about dictators, and, in some parts of the country and with some sections of our people, dictatorship has ceased to be merely a theoretical or academic question. There has been a growing skepticism of late about the efficiency of democratic institutions, and this skepticism often finds expression in a cynical contempt for the spiritual values of freedom and tolerance, which we had permitted ourselves to believe were the very foundation stones of our life as a people. In a time of economic chaos and widespread suffering, many jump to the conclusion that economic security and abundance are possible only under the coercion of a dictator, and American bankers and college professors return from Italy enthusiastic for Mussolini because the trains run on time and the beggars have been driven from the public view. Black shirts and fascist salutes have been accepted as almost universal panaceas.

Exponents of the Nordic complex believe the country has gone to the dogs, that is, to the immigrants. The administration of equal and impartial justice has on occasion been defeated by the ugly passions of racial or class strife. Without express-

ing for the moment any judgment on the merits of the controversies, it is most depressing to find ordinary labor headquarters in several cities raided by mobs, supported by so-called respectable citizens, on the mistaken ground that they were communist cells. If a mob can destroy newspaper presses without police intervention because the editors are supposed to be tinged with radicalism, or if in some sections of the country no meetings can be held unless their purpose is to express views entirely in accord with those who temporarily control the city police or the city government, how are we different from Russia and Italy and Germany when it comes to fundamental liberties like freedom of speech and freedom of the press? Much of our so-called citizenship training has been planned only to teach each new generation to think and act just like the old. Flag salutes are no substitute for that honesty and critical intelligence upon which democracy must rest, but they are prescribed by legal enactment, and the battle for freedom of teaching and investigation still must be waged on the frontiers of the social sciences, especially when a professor tries to make the results of his reflection and study of some practical use to the public. Occasionally influential pressure groups have tried to pollute the freedom and integrity of the teaching profession, and, in some instances, administrators and trustees who talk glibly on public occasions about encouraging research have tried to discipline the researcher when as a citizen, as well as a professor, he endeavored to give his results some public, social value. The country is flooded with propaganda. Race prejudice is always nearer the surface than we suppose. The calibre of public officials selected in some parts of the country in recent elections can give the honest voter only one sensation—the sensation of despair and nausea, yet the antics of our political mountebanks, grafters, and demagogues provoke nothing more serious among a large part of our people than a shrug of the shoulders, a smile of amusement, and an insatiable curiosity to be entertained by more of this silly and almost criminal twaddle. Not enough people remember the price preceding generations have paid for freedom, and they forget that democracy can only be achieved, and does not fall as a gift of the gods from Heaven.

Let us admit without argument the defects in the techniques of democratic government. They are especially glaring in times of storm and stress in the economic order or in the international order. Democracy has never claimed to be the most efficient form of government. The ills we are heir to under democracies are not unique. They appear in other ages and in other forms of government as well. There has never been an ideal autocracy in history. However useful and successful dictatorships may have been in coping with the original purpose for which they were created, history knows none that did not degenerate sooner or later into a government for the benefit of the privileged few. Liberty and tolerance have infinitely higher social and moral values than mere efficiency. Governmental perfection has never existed anywhere; the autocrat usually has flourished either through ruthless force, bluff, or shallow compromise, by exploiting either the passions or the follies of mankind.

The historic record of democracy is not without its brighter pages. The American democracy survived the greatest Civil War in history. It is under this type of government that we conquered and settled a continent in record time. Our democracy held out hope to millions of the persecuted of Europe, and absorbed, with hardly a ripple, forty million immigrants from scores of races and climes. It has provided a peaceful outlet for all manner of discontents; under it the individual has been protected against the tyranny of government; and it permitted a great people to grow in an orderly fashion by the slow process of experience.

Let us admit also that the functions of government are likely to be greatly enlarged as a result of the experiences of the last few years. The strange paradox of millions starving in a land of plenty cannot be defended on any specious appeal to a philosophy of "rugged individualism." All this emotional upheaval about preserving the liberties of the Fathers comes with peculiarly bad taste from many "rugged individualists" who remained anemic neutrals in the battle for the preservation of American liberties until *their* liberty to convert a five hundred dollar gamble on the stock market into a million of profits was inhibited in the social interest. It is entirely possible that an aroused social conscience, reinforced by a more rational and realistic attitude on the part of the more intelligent business and industrial leaders, may put an end to that unbridled, chaotic, competitive struggle which has brought us to our present state of desperation. Private interests have always been forced to yield to the public good, when the demand for change became sufficiently articulate. Democracy is not necessarily a negative device, and we may be witnessing the dawn of a more positive democratic state, which will destroy the sacred liberty of competition in starving to death in a sweat-shop or in a coal mine. A comprehensive program of social insurance probably is the only possible protection against the scourge of economic insecurity. Call it what you will—state capitalism, national planning, national socialism, or a New Deal—the social objective is the same, and an intelligent person will not be frightened or deterred by temporary labels. A democratic state need not cease to exist just because it takes a more positive interest in social justice and economic security than was necessary when Jefferson and Washington ruled a nation of three million farmers and small traders.

The great question is whether social justice and economic security can be achieved without abandoning the fundamentals of democracy, and whether it will be worth the price if we lose or sacrifice our faith in the democratic way of life. Democracy has been more important as an ideal of life than as a method of government. No Plato's Republic ever existed on this earth, but the one the ancient philosopher described goes on shaping the destiny of states. Rousseau's *Emile* described perhaps an unattainable ideal, but that ideal has been of sufficient practical consequence to affect education in most of the schools of the world today.

It seems to me that with the democratic way of life there came into the world certain supreme ethical and spiritual values that we cannot afford to surrender without returning to a lower order of civilization. Democracy has emphasized faith in

freedom; it stresses the integrity and value of the individual personality. It glorifies individual variation, rather than the submergence of everything in a blind conformity. It does not seek to eliminate differences by compulsion; it values individual differences, and seeks to conserve them through mutual respect. The true democrat thinks of America not as a country of fixed patterns and traditions, to be handed down from generation to generation, but as a process of life, "remaining ever unfinished."

A democracy needs a natural aristocracy of leadership and we must keep the road to leadership open to all who can properly find a place among the aristocracy of talent and virtue. To Jefferson, the enlightenment of the people was the corner-stone of the democratic structure, universities were founded on the illimitable freedom of the human mind, and therefore should be favorite objects with a free and intelligent people. Some of the greatest universities of Europe were established in a time of greatest national gloom and economic collapse. Whether the present day democracy still believes that institutions of learning should be *favorite* objects of a free and intelligent people must be determined in the light of the prevailing attitude in many quarters about what support educational institutions should get in times of business depression, and in comparison with general governmental expenditures. History is full of the story of peoples who once knew and cherished political and personal freedom, and then, in a moment of forgetfulness, indolence or crisis, resigned it and forever lost it, preferring prosperity or power or discipline or an inflated national ego, to freedom, and eventually losing all. In our own day, I need only point to Germany and Italy as evidences of nations willing to sacrifice democracy and liberty to dictatorships, and as proof that the domain of freedom once again is in danger of growing steadily smaller. Whatever the material benefits achieved in these countries, spiritual values have been sacrificed, and the value of a human personality counts less and less in the life of the state.

The fundamental law of democratic government is the law of change. Fascism and Communism are absolutes, blind, rigid, orthodox creeds, undebatable finalities. Both believe that discussion is the foe of action and dissipates the power and unity of the state, and both contend that, to a vigorous and aggressive social or political organism, individual liberties can only be an obstacle. The goal of these states is not an intelligent, critical citizenry, but a docile, regimented people. The school and the press are the organs by which the leaders tell the people that portion of the truth which they want them to know, and public opinion, instead of being an organ of criticism and self-expression, becomes a matter of emotion, to be whipped into a frenzy by the shrewd stagecraft of the dictator. Only true democracy believes in progress by experimentation, and avoids the dangerous swinging back and forth of the political pendulum between extremes. The democrat believes, in the words of Sidney Webb, in "the inevitability of gradualness." He sets up no dogmas, except faith in the possibilities of mankind, and in the virtues of freedom and toleration. He does not believe that finding the middle road of orderly development is necessarily a cowardly compromise; it may be the way of greatest courage.

Democracy is a spiritual conception of great dynamic power. Preceding generations have paid a great price for the right of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and the freedom to teach and to learn. Whether these supreme spiritual values, for which I can imagine no tolerable alternative, will endure beyond the chaos of these troublous times will depend largely on what this generation has learned about the ideals that inspired the American experiment. Democracy will not work automatically; it requires a certain wisdom and a certain devotion to the public good to make it function even moderately successfully. It must be achieved anew by each new generation; it does not fall upon us as a gift from the gods.

Professor Laski several years ago defined the elite in a democractic society as those few who have the capacity to discern ultimate values, who are prophets, yet hold aloof from wealth and power, who bow before no authority except the authority of truth, who are willing to proclaim unpleasant truths even at the risk of clashing with vested interests. How many have this vision of intelligent, courageous, and honest, unselfish public service?

In spite of the many gloomy indictments of our modern educational systems, I suspect the training of leaders for this kind of public service must remain largely the task of our institutions of higher learning. After all, there is no other human institution quite like a true university. It is a place where people learn to hope when others despair, to love freedom in its widest implications, to free their minds and hearts from malice and meanness and hypocrisy and prejudice,—a place where people somehow come to realize that moral and spiritual values really transcend the ordinary creature comforts. Education should give some glimpse of the vision of social justice, and some appreciation of the fundamental sacredness of human life. History records a ceaseless struggle of men, no better or no worse than we are, to win civilization, only to lose it again by inaction and indifference. The academic environment is peculiarly fitted to be the proving ground in the battle between the old and the new. Ideas and ideals are immortal, and it is the primary business of educators under all circumstances to make room for their free interplay, and to preserve the faith in the supreme spiritual value of the democratic way of life.

A true education must have a liberal objective, as well as an immediate, professional, utilitarian goal. Attitudes and viewpoints grounded on sound intellectual foundations are the major concern of the educational process. More than the acquisition of a mass of facts, a liberal education means an open mind, free from bias and preconceived ideas; a restless, insatiable quest for truth, a willingness to respect the old and to experiment with the new, a recognition of the eternal law of change, an abiding faith in the methods of free discussion and in the supreme values of liberty and toleration. The noblest achievement of mankind is a faith in these great human values, and a recognition that men can live nobly only when they live together in mutual respect and cooperative freedom.

Concerning Mussolini

LOLA MAVERICK LLOYD
[Special Correspondent from Geneva]

If reliable and well-known peace advocates had addressed a public appeal last year to the King and people of Italy to recognize the unbalanced mental condition of Benito Mussolini and put him safely out of power, would it have done any good? It might have. I thought it would. That is why I devoted months to this project originated by Rosika Schwimmer with her keen sense of effective peace action.

Until the Italians invaded Ethiopia she was working from her home in New York. I went on, trying desperately even after that to get important European signatures to the following:

COMMUNICATION

To His Majesty King Victor Emmanuel II and to the Beloved People of Italy:

While all the world seems hypnotized by one single human being, we who are still sane demand that Benito Mussolini, the Head of your Cabinet, your Minister of Interior Affairs, Minister of Colonies, Minister of the Navy and Minister of Air, Minister of Corporations and Minister of War be placed with care for his physical safety in a hospital in charge of the foremost alienists of our times.

ONLY A MADMAN would compel Italy to break every international Pact, Covenant, or Treaty made with the rest of the world.

ONLY A MADMAN would drive his fear-ridden people, men, women, and children, into a frenzy of mobilization against all other peoples.

ONLY A MADMAN would set out, in defiance of united world opinion, to crush a peaceful independent nation.

ONLY A MADMAN would take the risk of starting a world-wide war from which neither past nor future measures of neutrality can possibly save a single nation.

ONLY A MADMAN would threaten to cause between the colored and white races a clash so crucial as to wipe out civilization.

One single unbalanced brain against the world!

Commit Mussolini to an insane asylum and the world gains a breathing spell to put its house in order. The League of Nations has proved incapable of the bold, unprecedented moral action necessary to prevent war. The League even threatens, now that war has broken out, to endorse a "war to end war." In this emergency we urge you to recognize at once our common danger and join with the sane people of all nations in creating the only safeguard, a democratic non-military Federation of Nations. Eliminate Mussolini without bloodshed, and you prevent mankind's imminent self-destruction and permit the evolution of the race to its highest happy destiny.

Some anti-Fascists, ignorant of mental science, are still confused by Mussolini's cleverness, even genius, and do not believe him insane. Many others who agree with our diagnosis refused to sign because they foresaw failure and ridicule. Altogether, with signatures few and war started, the document could not be published.

Along our way, however, we came across the most unexpected corroboration of Mussolini's malady. There was the story of the three wise men who were wise enough to go and see for themselves. The foreign ministers of three European countries, grown suspicious, went together but quietly to Rome to have an audience with the Duce. This was before war had begun, but they had their troubles getting any appointment. Finally, because of their high rank, they could no longer be refused and they went to the palace at the appointed hour. There they waited standing in a great empty room for a very long time. At last Mussolini came in holding a little flag and ran round and round the room. They had no chance to speak to him, and he did not say a word himself. So they went home confirmed in their suspicions.

In Paris I talked with the clear-headed old Russian woman, Dr. Angelica Balabanoff, who was a collaborator of Lenin's and his trusted friend. Before the World War she was secretary of the Socialist International for years, living in Switzerland. It was there that she gave Mussolini at nineteen his first job on a Socialist paper. She speaks freely about his mind and character as a young man. His nervous condition was pitiable; he was always in terror of something. Dr. Balabanoff thought him syphilitic. She often had to accompany him home when they worked late because he was afraid to be alone in the dark. In his black moods of depression, he foretold his doom of insanity.

Later they worked together in Milan where he became an intolerant Socialist, trying to dissuade her from courageous action of any kind, fearful of criticism by the doctrinaires. And yet when war came and his comrades were determined to keep Italy neutral, he sold out to the bribing militarists. His paper became a pro-war organ and helped drive Italians to the shambles.

The ex-president of the ministry of Italy, Signor Nitti, who has to live in Paris now, told me a more scientific observer than any of us had frankly declared Mussolini insane some ten years ago, the well-known psychiatrist, Professor Mingarzini, of the University of Rome.

It is the experts, by the way, in mental science who have seen beneath the surface of our common knowledge concerning demagogues and offered the pacifists their aid, the first scientists to organize themselves for world peace. Over three hundred of the most eminent psychiatrists and psychologists of Europe and America published from Amsterdam last October a statement urging the perfectly possible mental analysis of all political leaders who may have in their hands the power to make war. They named no names. The public can guess which statesmen are the greatest menace now. Would that science might test them for mental flaws and give us the verdict in time!

The British Government must have known the mental unbalance of Mussolini last summer. At any rate a highly-placed barrister said that the Foreign Office considered him mad. All the foreign offices everywhere knew it long ago and could have used their knowledge somehow to stop the outbreak of that war in Africa.

From the beginning they must have been aware, too, of the unreal character of Mussolini's boasting propaganda. Now we can all learn the truth about it if we will read something besides the newspapers. George Seldes destroyed for some of us the myth of Mussolini's greatness in his *Sawdust Caesar*.

Now comes a serious study of the relations of capital and labor in Italy by Gaetano Salvemini of Harvard. Professor Salvemini is an authority on the remarkable economic development of pre-Fascist Italy, so little understood by outsiders. The Italian progress of that period has been concealed ever since by Fascist propaganda in order to exaggerate their own very moderate achievements.

In *Under the Axe of Fascism* he proves relentlessly from Fascist documents that Mussolini's boasts are pure humbug. Even in Italian the magic phrase, the "Corporative State" itself can have no meaning since corporations mostly do not exist. Where a few groups have been dubbed corporations, they have no function. Workers are cruelly exploited. Financial reports are faked. Statistics on unemployment are wild guesses to begin with and "cooked" propaganda in final form. Everything the International Labor Office gets from official Italy is suspect, and the Labor office never investigates, just prints what it is told.

How satisfying Salvemini's conclusions are to the cynics that remember our own war-time propaganda! We have let publicity from Italy roll on while, unimpressed, we doubted whether the evil we so clearly saw in the laws and acts of Mussolini could possibly bring forth good fruit. What a relief never again to have to swallow those lies about Italian trains running on time for the Duce! Swamps drying up for the Duce. Public housing invented by the Duce. Roman ruins discovered by him, etc., etc. If the tale were not so bitterly tragic, we could laugh at Salvemini's humorous understatements. His facts are devastating enough. They challenge us to action. And when we know the facts about Italy and guess the truth about Mussolini, how can we make our diplomats humane? To know that the great rabble-rouser is insane and his propaganda one big fake and still to let a war be waged and others threatened rather than show him up! What a tough conscience diplomats must cultivate to "play the game." They let chaos cover the earth rather than break precedents and go down in disgrace from their place of power and glory. War is inevitable, anyway, and gentlemen do not tell tales out of school. I wonder if "gentlemen" ever save the world!

Certainly the run-of-the-mill statesman is not going to give away disagreeable secrets about Mussolini and make a martyr of himself to save us. We must do the job ourselves and broadcast all the facts we can get hold of.

The question is can we make enough honest noise to give our statesmen just a little courage so they will find the way to make a beginning of sensible cooperation between nations before the insane ruler of Rome and his German twin have all the military morons of the world in full cry?

Trumpets on New Horizons

The Foxes Have Holes

The foxes have holes
  And the birds of the air
Feather nests in the boles
  Of the trees' gentle lair.

But the lone son of man
  That happens to be
Born under the ban
  Of Jewry,

Has nowhere to lay
  His fugitive head
In the terrible day
  When the nations see red:

But is stoned by the slings
  Of the brothers of Christ,
Who forget for such things
  Was once sacrificed.

The life of a Jew . . .
  Whose blood flows again
At every new
  Persecution of men.

MARIE D'AUTREMONT GERRY.

Unshriven

Cold and want and need of bread—
Are only things of which I've read
While I am warmly housed and fed.

I live my days like a fish in a bowl;
What can I do to shrive my soul—
Will honest pity make me whole?

VIVIAN NEYERDAHL

The Vandal

Man slaughters life on shrines of savage greed,
  Uproots the rose to plant a thistle bed
As Christian burns the rivals of his creed
  And leaves a million children underfed.
He robs the weak with devilish clan
  To throw a banquet for his poodle dog;
With specious gesture hails forgotten man
  While deep in gain he wallows like a hog.

Insane with lust and predatory dreams
  He gasses woman and her helpless child,
He shells a hospital and rapes a Rheims
  And pays lip-debts to Christ, the meek and mild.
Then in the role of lowly Nazarene
He feeds the victims of his war-machine.

EDWIN BARLOW EVANS

Citadel of Silence

At the heart of this blaring world
Where noise pounds against noise,
Where self beats against self;
Determined, let us build
A citadel of silence—
Where no noise pounds,
Where no selves artfully battle,
Where only love will pulse
In harmony with love.

Let us build a citadel of quietness
Profound with love;
Form it of the stuff of God . . .
Until exhalations permeate
All brazen air that whirls in tumult . . .

Then noise pounding will have become
Triumphant music pouring—filling space . . .
Then selves clashing will have become
A rhythmic harmony of Desire, unselfed—
A living symphony unfolding
One great Theme—a fugue of LOVE.

M. LOUISE GREEN.

The Study Table

Roosevelt and Capitalism

THE MENACE OF ROOSEVELT AND HIS POLICIES. *By Howard Eldred Kershner. New York: Greenberg. $1.00.*

This is an attack, direct and devastating in its implications, upon President Roosevelt and his advisors in their attempt to bring America out of the depression. The author believes that the administration policies have failed except in so far as they have delayed a recovery which began several years ago in other parts of the world, and that only the destruction of these policies by the Supreme Court, beginning with the unanimous decision on the NRA, has left us free at last to swing into the current of better days. He makes effective use of the experience of Australia and of England, where there was no New Deal to stay the operation of natural restorative forces, and where governmental policy encouraged economy, reduced expenditures, enlarged production, and established a rigorously balanced budget, as contrasted with the deliberately created scarcity and the wild orgy of government spending which have all but ruined this nation. But Mr. Kershner believes that the danger is not yet over—not if Mr. Roosevelt is reelected this fall! In such contingency, he sees either a collapse of national credit under the burden of the federal debt, or else inflation. In either case, we shall have something like a final calamity for the American people.

But this little book is more than an attack upon the present administration. It is, in its more important aspect, a restatement of the case for capitalism. What the author sees in capitalism is a self-regulating system of wealth production, for the success of which there is needed a balance, or equilibrium, of forces which will enable exchange of goods to freely operate. This balance, if not interfered with, is itself maintained by the law of supply and demand. But the balance *is* interfered with—increasingly so! Government steps in and establishes a high tariff, or regulates wages, or pegs prices, or subsidizes one interest at the expense of another, or establishes public works to compete with private industry, or imposes inordinate or confiscatory taxes. Trade unionism gains control of some industry, and sets up a rigorous wage scale which is out of relation with other wage scales, and thus throws the natural economy out of adjustment. Monopoly intrudes with its dictatorial restriction of output and extravagant price level in pursuit of selfish profits. Thus, in one way or another, an economic system, all right in itself, is thrown out of balance, and there comes a collapse, or depression. And instead of leaving things alone, to right themselves, government interferes more recklessly than ever, thus making a bad situation infinitely worse. Mr. Kershner believes that in capitalism we have an economic system which is capable of regulating itself as successfully as the physical system of the human organism. In the one case as in the other, there are diseases, and accidents which bring injury. But, as in medicine the physician and surgeon intrude only to help nature to help herself, so in economics the statesman should intrude only to free the system for its own recovery. As an illustration of how capitalism can work, and does work if left alone, Mr. Kershner cites the record of the automobile industry in this country. It is an impressive story, which may well give the Socialist pause.

It is interesting to see how largely a consistent capitalist like Mr. Kershner agrees with the Socialist in his condemnation of the Roosevelt policies. There are of course fundamental disagreements—as, for example, on the issue of public works, which Mr. Kershner thinks something far worse than nonsense. Spending, he insists, will never get us anywhere except to ruin—and we agree! But the conservative and the radical are absolutely together in opposition to such policies as the creation of scarcity, the artificial raising of the price level, the debauching of the currency, and the mad mania of militaristic expenditures. Whether seen from the left or from the right, the Roosevelt administration presents a sorry spectacle.

Mr. Kershner's volume is healthy as well as fascinating reading. It should have wide distribution in this campaign year.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

The Relation of Christianity to Communism

CREATIVE SOCIETY. *By John Macmurray. 168 pp. New York: Association Press. $1.50. (Available also in a ten cent paper cover edition—full text.)*

Here is the most exciting book we have seen since Meiklejohn's *What Does America Mean?*, Loeb's *The Chart of Plenty,* or John Haynes Holmes' *If This Be Treason.*

The Professor of Philosophy at University College, London, begins by saying that the difficulty of comparing Christianity and Communism is that most people do not know just what they mean by Christianity, while Communists know just exactly what Communism is. After showing that the eternal element in all religions is that which makes for greater community among men, he attacks pseudo-religion.

Organized Christianity for the most part has become degenerated in one or two ways. Either it has become unreal, and therefore false, by escaping into an imaginary realm of the mystical; or it has become drunken with the lust for power, and, therefore, just as false.

Professor Macmurray's chapter on "The Religion of Jesus" is tremendous. We predict it will be a classic. Simply and clearly he shows from the Gospel narratives that Jesus knew well that mankind could only be redeemed from the exploitation of the ruling class by a consecrated, loyal, devoted minority that must be recruited from the poor people. Thus Jesus chose his disciples from the toilers. This minority was the leaven that worked its way into the meal of the Roman Empire. It has been the salt that has made every civilization ever since palatable.

If one urges that Professor Macmurray is trying to prove Jesus a Communist, chronology demands that "the real relation between Christianity and Communism is reversed." Karl Marx was a Christian in the sense that with Jesus he saw that no religion is genuine which does not first take care of mankind's material needs. This, however, is only the negative pole of Jesus' religion. The positive is based on love, man's unerring instinct making for that larger community which breaks down the barriers of race, nation, creed, clan, etc.

Of course, many have been deluded by Commu-

nism's atheistic tendency. This was inevitable in that organized Christianity in all lands belied its profession of belief in one God and Father of all, making all men brothers. The Christian often says he believes in God, but proves by his life and his vote for capitalistic parties that he does not believe in the evolutionary power in this universe making for larger community among men, the only real God there is. The Communist says he does not believe in God, but proves by his sacrifices and work for humanity's redemption that he does believe in God, who makes for brotherhood. "Not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, but he that doeth the will of the Father of Mankind, shall enter the Kingdom."

Communism must recognize that its dialectic is based solely on satisfying for men the hunger instincts, and must adopt the larger program of Jesus, which includes Communism but adds the cultural life of love. We think things in Russia are moving so fast that if Professor Macmurray were writing now he would doubtless realize that Communism in the U. S. S. R. is going on to develop human possibilities of a cultural and spiritual nature.

The book challenges Christians to live the Christ they profess.

A new synthesis of Communism and Christianity is in the making. Communism has called all Christians, capable of seeing, back to Jesus' insistence that no religion is worth the name unless it cares for the material needs of men, women, and little children.

Very valuable is the book for its insights into the present international situation, with the U. S. S. R. and Britain the great bulwarks against another World War. Peace at any price for Britain, since a war would demolish her, as would Fascism which holds within itself the seeds of its own disintegration. The U. S. S. R., France, and Britain protect humanity against reaction.

GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE.

Correspondence

To the President

[Editorial Note: We glady grant the request of these two peace workers to publish in the columns of UNITY letters written to the President.]

I

To Franklin D. Roosevelt
President of the United States
My dear Mr. President:

As a young person preparing for a life of constructive work for human welfare, but seeing all about me the groundwork laid to coerce youth to participate in the mass murder and destruction of war, I beg you to assert our country's leadership on the side of constructive instead of passive peace by accepting the proposal of the Uruguayan Government to offer mediation in the Spanish Civil War.

In 1915, the late President Wilson had a similar opportunity to cooperate with the other neutral nations in ending the World War before the militarists ended it. At that time delegates from the International Congress of Women at The Hague (April, May, 1915) presented a plan for a Neutral Conference to offer Continuous Mediation to the belligerents until terms of peaceful settlement, acceptable to both sides, could be reached. President Wilson had sympathy for the plan, but refused to call or to take part in such a conference.

His hesitating policy was largely responsible for the prolongation of the War and our entry into it. And how tragic for us and for the world that an administration afraid to commit itself to the insignificant risks involved in bringing about peace without victory, as proposed by the Women's Congress, was not at all fearful about involving this country in the most disastrous war in history! To careful students of that period and this, the truth of the prediction of The Hague Women's Congress becomes more and more evident; that war ended by militarists means peace dictated by militarists with causes for future conflict.

We young people watch with appreciation your work for domestic reconstruction, but we cannot help asking you and ourselves: "What's the use of it all if we are not to live to help build and enjoy this better era?" For our study of history has amply demonstrated that only in the work for world peace has our nation managed to remain isolationist; in international war, never!

For the sake of the generations born during the war and since, won't you break this vicious circle by pledging our nation to the work of war-prophylaxis instead of to the hopeless task of trying to save our skins once war is under way? And won't you, as a first positive step in this direction, offer mediation to Spain, in cooperation with other neutrals or alone?

Young people appeal to you for time out from international murder and destruction—precious time to undertake the difficult work of world reorganization to eliminate, as our forty-eight states have eliminated, the possibility of future war. But we cannot gain this precious "breathing spell" unless you, Mr. President, desert the vicious conspiracy preparing full-blast to wipe out once more the strongest and the best in a whole generation, leaving only the weak and demented for the heroic work of clearing the mess.

Desperately yours,
EDITH WYNNER.

New York City

II

To the President of the United States
My dear Mr. President:

I am sorry to see that Washington is reported as cool toward the proposals of the Uruguayan Minister to offer mediation to Spain. Twenty-one years ago, in 1915, President Wilson refused to act on the appeals of delegates of the Women's Peace Conference at The Hague, of Henry Ford, and of a large number of American citizens to issue a call for a Neutral Conference for Mediation. He made no such noble attempt to stop the war. The war

continued, and the United States joined the fray to the everlasting sorrow of the American people.

That the Spanish bloodshed may easily involve other countries is only too obvious. Haven't we paid enough in loss of lives, in crippling of men during the World War, and in present suffering from the economic effects of the war? Hasn't the lesson of Wilson's refusal to mediate been bitter and striking enough for every intelligent American to realize that we can't keep out of a world war—that every attempt should be made to stop a war raging anywhere while the stopping is good?

That some Americans prefer to dwell in fairyland with the cherished dream of remaining unentangled and neutral while the rest of the world goes mad around us only makes it the more necessary for our responsible statesmen to face realities.

I appeal to you as the most responsible statesman in the land to join other nations in their offer of mediation to Spain. Mediation now to save the world from chaos!

Here is a challenge to bring your foreign policy, too, out of the "horse and buggy days."

Urgingly yours,

GEORGIA LLOYD.

Winnetka, Illinois.

From Governor Landon's State

Editor of UNITY:

Enclosed is $2.00 to pay for nine months' subscription to your magazine which I value very highly. My reason for not being able to send enough for a full year is that I live in the state of Governor Landon where purchasing power has been so reduced by his method of saving on governmental expense.

This does not mean I sanction all the other party has done in spending, but see and know that neither party has mentioned any reduction of our appropriations for war preparedness which would give us the opportunity to keep our budget balanced.

What we need to do first of all is work for the amendment to the Constitution to outlaw war; then, using reason to settle our own relationship with other countries, we should be able to work towards the economic solution of causes of strife. It is our present monetary unit which gives the power of appropriation and should be replaced by a medium of exchange which represented one hour of adult service in equal exchange for an hour of another adult as shown in the goods to be exchanged.

This would be the only means of giving us equal freedom and make natural resources free to all alike. Any other method gives the rule of some over others and would be working in the wrong direction.

MAMIE SCHELLENBERG.

Arkansas City, Kansas.

Gandhi Misquoted—and UNITY Misled

[EDITORIAL NOTE: In our issue of June 1st last, we published an editorial commenting on a news report from India describing a serious difference which was said to have arisen between Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharal Nehru on matters of party and public policy. This editorial, entitled "Gandhi Meets Force Again," was based on a detailed despatch from India, published in one of our greatest and most authoritative American newspapers, quoting Gandhi directly and at length. Our editorial was prompted by a sense of the great importance of the news, and in all good faith that it was genuine.

We have now received two letters from India stating emphatically and without reservation that there was no truth of any kind in the report upon which we relied. We print these letters herewith.

It seems appalling that our best news sources should prove thus to be untrustworthy. British propaganda in one of our highest-class newspapers—and we fell for it! Our regret for such an error is deeper than we can express.]

I

Dear Dr. Holmes:

I was quite surprised to read in UNITY of 1st June 1936, the Editorial paragraph headed "Gandhi Meets Force Again." The statements made there were so extraordinary that I felt bound to refer them to Mahatma Gandhi, who is at Wardha. I am passing on his reply to you as desired by him and I trust that you will give as much prominence to his categorical contradiction as to the statements in the paragraph. This is important as UNITY is regarded here and elsewhere as being in touch with Gandhiji and the statements are calculated to do much harm.

K. NATARAJAN, Editor,
The Indian Social Reformer.

Bombay, India.

II

Dear Friend (K. Natarajan):

Mahader has just sent me your letter. The Editorial you have sent me from UNITY is extraordinary. The views attributed to me and reproduced in inverted commas were never uttered by me, and what is more they have never been held by me. From nothing that I have heard from Jawaharal's lips have I ever even suspected that he contemplated the use of violence for the attainment of India's independence. It is surprising how Dr. Holmes has allowed himself to be duped into thinking that I had ever made the remarks said to have been made by me. You can make whatever use you like of this letter and, to save time, you may pass on this letter to Dr. Holmes, if you think it proper.

Yours sincerely,

M. K. GANDHI.

Wardha, India.

Praecognitio

We are but flecks of dust called men
blown to and fro by gust of circumstance
Till we have lost direction.
Fashioning our fate into confusions indeterminate
Blindly we flutter on, not seeing Life as Life,
The Whole—but each an unrelated part.
Grant that at the last we may become as blades of grass,
Secure in a stability of serviceableness.

FLORA WHITE.

The Field

(*Continued from page 2*)

But this cost we *must* mind. It is intolerable to the Christian spirit that we should forget the human havoc which economic depression has caused, and which no haphazard business revival can possibly cure. Out of the crucible of these recent years, one iron purpose should be forged; namely, the will that nothing shall divert us from the continuing effort to find those necessary ways of readjustment—whether through voluntary cooperative organizations, through taxation, or through other practicable social controls—by which those who are now doomed to a cramped existence may be set free into larger life.

The Christian influence ought to bring to our contemporary world three things:

First, a compassionate heart.

Christian individuals and Christian churches must be sensitive to the need of all who suffer. We must not allow ourselves to forget, nor let the community forget, the men and women in industrial towns reduced to a bleak and almost hopeless existence through unemployment; the undernourished children in families where relief budgets are too small; the sweatshops and child labor in some industries; the wretchedness of those who live round the shafts of idle coal mines; the exploited sharecroppers and homeless migrants in many of our agricultural areas; the Negroes denied equal justice; and all others upon whom the bitter pressure of unfair conditions falls. We are bound to remember that it was with such as these that our Master identified Himself when He said: "Inasmuch as ye did it not unto the least of these my brethren, ye did it not unto Me."

Second, a courageous mind.

The Christian conscience does not make us more nearly infallible than other men in technical details. It does not equip us to speak dogmatically on precise political or economic programs. But it ought to, and does, give a clarity of central judgment. It turns upon all questions the light of one supreme consideration. Because it believes that all men are the children of God, it believes that the only right ideal for any community is one in which there shall be freedom for all men to develop in thought and in action the best that is in their personalities. Therefore, the Christian spirit must stand like a flaming sword against all frightened attempts to bring upon America that shackling of human thought and that stifling of independent speech which lie like a dark shadow on those lands where dictatorship prevails. The teachers' oath bills introduced in many legislatures and passed by some, the "gag laws" introduced in Congress, the vicious assaults upon academic freedom, and ultimately upon academic honesty, the widespread denial of the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively, which have been launched by sinister influences under the mask of patriotism, are denials not only of political democracy, but of the Christian faith in the dignity of the human soul; and with them, therefore, the Christian Church can have no part nor lot.

Third, a faith in the will of Christ as the one and only way for our world's redemption.

In these immediate days when the conditions of our world have become so ominous, we need the heroic confidence of this faith. There is too much bitterness already in our domestic affairs. There is too much bitterness between the nations. The conflicts of economic interest and the antagonisms between economic classes are turning away from patient reasonableness toward forcible repression on one side and violence on the other. Many today believe that our social unrest will lead to revolution, and that the old hatreds between the nations are leading inevitably to new war. But those who follow Christ will yield to no such impotent fatalism. In thought, in conversation, and in our influence on public policy, we must set forward and persistently support those measures of cooperation and constructive service through which a better social order may be peaceably achieved. We must resist the policy of increased armaments and the growth of military control, and unflaggingly urge the participation of the United States in study and adjustment among the nations of those inequalities, political and economic, from which wars take their rise.

Christians should follow the pioneering example of those who, like Kagawa, make love the controlling principle in personal, economic, and international relationships. Such men may be hated, misunderstood, persecuted, executed even; but they can be the seed for the future. Though the pathway lead to a cross we remember that the cross is the sign not of defeat, but of final triumph.

Facts for Labor Sunday

(See *Information Service,* published by Research Department, Federal Council of Churches, issues of March 7, May 30 and June 13, 1936.)

The National Industrial Conference Board estimated that 9,901,000 were unemployed in August, 1935, and the statistician of the President's Committee on Economic Security estimated that 11,103,000 were unemployed in that month. The American Federation of Labor estimated that there were still 11,506,000 unemployed in April, 1936. These millions remained unemployed even though the volume of production (according to the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics) had increased 43% between 1932 and 1935.

Among the unemployed there are, according to the estimate of John W. Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education, about 5,000,000 young persons between the ages of sixteen and twenty-five who can find no useful place in society.

In January, 1936, there were 6,385,740 persons eligible for work relief jobs. Of these 4,376,795 were heads of families, and the families included 2,008,945 other employable workers. The Federal government provided work relief for about 3,400,000 heads of families. This left about 1,000,000 heads of families for state and local governments to look after, in addition to those classed as "unemployables," the aged, the sick, etc. (Survey by Works Progress Administration.)

Average hourly wages in manufacturing industries increased 20.1 per cent from 1932 to 1935 (the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported in a special study). Average weekly wages, which constitute the most significant figures regarding the welfare of the average worker, increased only 18.9 per cent. Since the cost of living increased 9.1 per cent, the purchasing power of average weekly wages of those who were employed increased less than 10 per cent.

The dividends of 2,010 corporations, according to the National City Bank *Bulletin* for April, 1936, increased 42 per cent in 1935 over 1934. The May issue of the same *Bulletin* shows that the net profits of 245 corporations for the first

quarter of 1936 increased 42.3 per cent over the first quarter of 1935.

The index of the purchasing power of farm products (as published by the Federal Bureau of Agricultural Economics) shows the following variations in recent years, the period 1910-1914 being taken as a base of 100: 1935, 86; 1934, 73; 1933, 64; 1932, 61; 1931, 70; 1930, 87. On April 1, 1936, farm wage rates per month, with board, averaged $20.89 the country over; per month without board, $30.87; per day, with board, $1.05; per day without board, $1.43.

It is estimated that in the ten chief cotton states over 60 per cent of those engaged in the production of cotton are tenants and sharecroppers. Under the cotton acreage adjustment program, tenants were evicted in large numbers. It is estimated that the 10,000,000 acres taken out of production by the reduction program made the services of about 500,000 families unneeded.

A Creed for Cooperative Living

I believe in good will.

I believe that good will is the divinest activity of the spirit of man, the wisest method, and the most powerful force in the realm of human relations.

I believe in my neighbor's sacred sovereignty over his own life. Therefore I will not trespass on his domain or seek dominion over his ideas or conduct.

I believe in the good will of my neighbor; I believe that he is trying, according to his light, as I am trying according to mine, to do what is right and good.

I believe that truth, like a sphere, has an infinite number of sides, that it is vaster than any man's vision, and greater than any man's opinion.

I believe, therefore, that I see some truth which my neighbor may not see, and which I must in fidelity pursue. I believe equally that my neighbor sees some truth which I may not see, so I will be open-minded and catholic.

I believe that I have more defects in manner, speech, disposition and temperament than I can detect or am willing to own. Therefore it ill becomes me to be too sharp a critic of my fellows.

I believe that humor is one of the major gifts of God. I hope for my sake that my neighbor possesses it; I pray for my sake and for his that I may have enough of it to laugh at myself, and to smile at that in others which makes the solemn rage.

I believe that the happiness and success of my neighbor are as important as my own. Therefore I will seek in behalf of others the same things that I seek for myself.

I believe that in our economic world the welfare of a part is not to be found apart from the welfare of the whole. Therefore, I will seek that order which promises to produce the fullest measure of justice, liberty and opportunity for all.

I believe that this world which science has made into a community must now be made into a neighborhood. Therefore, I will seek to be fair to people of other nations, to free my mind from narrow prejudice, and to grant to other peoples and races the same rights and privileges that I claim for my country. I will further seek to establish methods by which reason and the spirit of good will may be used to adjudicate differences among nations, confident that peace on earth can be maintained among men of good will.

I believe in Eternal Good Will; that there is in this universe a creative Spirit which prompts, inspires and sustains men who are engaged in the adventure of brotherhood, thereby building a finer and fairer world, emptier of denial and fuller of hope for all mankind.—The late Jay T. Stocking in *Advance*.

We Will Not Fight!

"I am hoping to see the day when the British working class movement will be organized effectively to resist any attempt to plunge the country into war, and when the working class movements of other lands will take similar steps to frustrate the war-mongers. Such an attitude on the part of the people who are called upon to fight as well as pay should receive the wholehearted support of every lover of peace, irrespective of party or creed.

"When the statesmen know that the people will not respond to the call of the bugle, they will refrain from the policy of war. War will become impossible when the people say, 'No More War' and mean it."

ROBERT SMILIE, M. P.

EYES ON WISCONSIN!

Only a few days ago the first unemployment insurance benefit check ever issued in the United States was handed to a jobless workman in Madison, and Wisconsin again demonstrated its position of leadership in social and labor legislation.

Only a few days ago, too, farm, labor and Progressive Party leaders met in Madison and outlined plans for the establishing of a great national third party to function actively in the next national campaign.

Thus does Wisconsin play a leading part in legislative and political matters and attract the interested attention of the nation. In 1936 it is more than ever true that the eyes of the nation are on Wisconsin.

Carrying Wisconsin's message of liberalism throughout the nation and making journalistic history in the weekly newspaper field is THE PROGRESSIVE, successor to the old La Follette's monthly magazine, published at Madison, Wis. No paid advertising appears in The Progressive. No advertisers' threats distort or suppress its news.

The Progressive is not limited in scope to Wisconsin. Its field is national, and in it you will find the facts about what is going on in the liberal and labor movements throughout the nation.

A special trial subscription offer makes it easy for you to become a reader. For only 20 cents you can receive the next 10 issues of this unique, different publication. Send 20 cents today to:

THE PROGRESSIVE, Dept. N
Madison, Wisconsin

A MONTHLY DIGEST

Every month you will find news in THE ARBITRATOR that was previously unknown to you. Your money back if that promise is not fulfilled.

THE ARBITRATOR presents facts of social significance evaded by other publications. That makes it radical. And it will correct any misstatement discovered. That makes it truthful—more radical.

THE ARBITRATOR has no axe to grind; it is not dull. Not an under-dog itself, yet snappy.

The aim is to outlaw war, abolish poverty, unveil superstition and secure justice. The method is to examine current events as a scientist searches for truth—without bias—with faith in the world as it really is.

Send 25 cents for a six months' trial; or 60 cents for a year's subscription.

114 East 31st St., New York City

WHO'S WHO IN OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT

A book of intimate facts about the people who run your government. 136 pages with tables and charts.

Gives party affiliations, place of birth, racial descent, religious and fraternal affiliations, previous occupation and political offices held, and military service rendered, for the president, Supreme Court, cabinet, heads of bureaus, senators and representatives of the U. S. Also contains the Constitution, Declaration of Independence and miscellaneous information on government and political affairs.

For sale by The Fellowship Forum, 1065 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D. C. Price: 50 cents, stamps or coin. Order your copy today.